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Personality has been craze not only to psychologists but also even to a layman since ancient times. So many scientists have studied personality. Eysenck, Young, Kresamar, Sheldon etc studied various aspects of personality, which are known as personality factors. These personality factors are developed through child rearing practices. Whether they are determined by the genetic factors or environmental (social & cultural) factors is the main question. In personality factors Birth order of the person also plays an important role. Each child in a family unit has a unique personality. One factor that can influence differences in personality is birth order. Each child has a particular place in the family structure based on when they arrived.

2.1 Birth order and Personality

First is the oldest child, who spent some time (perhaps years) being an only child. This child will always be “first” in the parents’ lives. In the most loving of families, the first-born may resent losing the parents’ undivided attention and may envy the newcomer siblings. The oldest child will be the first to achieve all milestones and will be the benchmark that the other children may be measured against. The oldest child is the first to experience the first of growing up and may be the target of envy (or ridicule) of younger siblings when they start school or have a first date. The oldest child is the first to buck parental authority and negotiate parental expectations. Growing up in a healthy family environment, the oldest child will tend to exhibit leadership qualities and may grow up to be a trendsetter. However, if the child grows up in a dysfunctional household, he or she may be burdened with too much adult responsibility, too
fast and lose their childhood. First born need responsibility in small doses appropriate to their age to flourish.

Although the firstborn is first to experience growing pains, the middle child experience is also unique. The struggle of the middle child is comically exemplified in the old Brady Bunch episode when Jan (the middle child) laments “It’s always Marsha, Marsha, and Marsha!” Many middle children can relate to that scene, as the oldest (and then the youngest) tends to take most of the attention. Middle children can feel “lost in the shuffle”, even growing up in an ideal TV family like the Brady’s. In a dysfunctional home, the ignorance may be so prevalent that the middle child is neglected or even abused as the family scapegoat. Middle children need to feel that they have a special place in the family unit.

Finally, the last-born does not have the least of challenges. Being “the baby” of the family can seem like fun, but being the last to do everything can be frustrating, as they often want to tag along with older siblings and can feel shut out. This can lead to rebellious behavior like tantrums and tattling to get back at the older children. On the positive side, in a loving family, the last child can feel very protected and accepted and may tend to like being around people, as he or she has had a good experience being the center of attention in a group. In a dysfunctional home, however, the last-born may feel responsible to “play mascot” and “be cute” to entertain everyone to cover up the pain going on in the home. The youngest child needs to feel that they can grow up and are loved for what lies beneath their “cuteness”.

Whatever the birth order, an important factor to help all of these personality types flourish is to be praised and valued for the individuals that they are, and their special place respected in the family unit. If this relationship
between birth order anxiety, and affiliation were general one, we would expect that birth order would be related to other activities in which affiliation is an important component. Several studies from outside the laboratory support this relationship.

According to David B. L. (2007) the habits of many middle borns are motivated by the fact that they have never been truly in the spotlight. The firstborn always seems to be achieving and pioneering, while the next sibling may be secure in his niche as the entertainer of the family, Middle-born children are thought to be natural mediators. They tend to have fewer pictures take compared to firstborns. Middle-born children may avoid conflict, but develop diplomacy skills and flexibility with ideas, which can make them entrepreneurial. Middle children may have an even-temper and take-it-or-leave-it attitude.

Some argue that the prestigious position of being first born prepares them for certain careers. One of these careers is political leadership. Being the Oldest, a child may have had pre training as a leader of the sibling and in the family making they better qualified for a future as a political leader. Andeweg and Van Den Berg looked at data from almost 1200 incumbents and concluded that being first born increases the likely hood of attaining political office (Andeweg & Van Den Berg, 2003). Middle Borns and Later Borns were underrepresented in incumbents. Once again, a study lends support to the theory that for whatever reason, birth order does play a role in which we may become.

There is another study that looks at categories of life style themes. These themes run along the same lines as the other birth position characteristics. They found that First Borns had positive correlations to 3 of the 10 BASIS-A scales, taking charge, wanting recognition and striving for perfection. (Gfroerer et al, 2003). Middle Borns showed a relationship to 6 of the 10 scales; negative related
to belonging/social interest, going along, striving for perfection and softness. They were positive related to being cautious and harshness. The Youngest had significant findings with 5 of the 10 scales, belonging/social interest, entitlement, striving for perfection and softness were positively related. Being cautious was negatively related. These themes are in line with other findings on birth order and personality traits.

Subjective impressions may be one of the reasons psychologist and nonpsychologists alike persist in attaching important to birth order. Relationships are the foundation of the family, whether good or bad. These relationships are predicated on one’s position in the family. Our perceptions of these positions may influence how we feel about certain relationships. Salmon (2002) reports that birth order had a significant impact. Middle Borns express more positive views towards friends and less positive opinions of family in general. Middle Borns were less likely to help family member in need than First Borns or Youngest. Middle Borns were less family oriented but were the least likely to cheat on their partner. This behavior could reflect back on how they felt as a middle child, “squeezed out”, with no alliance with the family.

Guastello D.D. & Guastello S.J. (2002) the oldest-born and the only-born have been reported to take more internal responsibility for their actions. Falbo (1981) theorized that oldest children had probably developed this sense of responsibility because they were more often put in charge and the only because they had no one else to blame things on. Similarly, Phillips and Phillips (1994) found that first and only children tend to attribute others’ work performance to internal factors more so then later-born. First-born weight lifters showed a more internal locus-of-control as well as a greater need for achievement than later-born (Hill, Church, & Stone, 1980). Among alumni of a social work college, first-born and only males felt they had too much responsibility toward their families,
whereas later-born males identified more with the role of the unfertilized child (Lackie, 1984). Findings for females were similar. Other research also supports the idea that first-born and only children demonstrate more responsibility than later-borns (Hansson, Chernovetz, Jones, & Stortz, 1978; Howarth, 1980).

Most parents would agree that they hope that all their children have average to above average intelligence. When there is only one child competing for the parent's attention, that child may receive the advantage of one to one stimulation. As the family grows, the time spent with each child becomes minimal and may disappear altogether. Is the intelligence of each child predetermined by genetics or can intelligence be "learned"? In looking within families, patterns appear relatively random with little relationship of intelligence to birth order (Rodgers, 2001). The additional time the first child spends with his parents before the sibling come along may lend itself to his personality but not to his intelligence.

In 2001, Stewart, Stewart and Campbell again looked at psychological birth order and its relationship to family atmosphere and to personality. Family atmosphere is the context in which children start to develop guidelines for their behavior. The family atmosphere is affected by the parents' relationship and the implementation of values. In the study, Stewart et al measure two dimensions of family atmosphere, relational characteristics i.e.: close, conflicted, distant, cooperative and conveyance of family values, interest and activities. What are the content issues and activities around which the family typically relates (Stewart, Stewart & White, 2001) The PBOI and Family of Origin scale were used to measure the interaction between the two. The researchers found that overall there was a significant relationship between psychological birth order scale, actual birth order and the family atmosphere variables (Stewart, Stewart & White, 2003). In the second part of the study, relationship between personality
characteristics and psychological birth order was measured using the PBOI and the Personality research form (PRF). The PRF is a 352 true false item inventory that generates 20 personality traits. In the study only 14 of the traits that were relevant were used. These scales address the need for achievement, affiliation, aggression, autonomy, cognitive structure, dependence, domination, exhibition, harm avoidance, impulsivity, order, sentience, social recognition, and understanding. The research had mixed support, 48% of the hypothesized relationships being observed (Stewart, Stewart & Campbell, 2001). Some of the correlations that were found were; the psychologically first scale was negatively associated with the trait of impulsivity, an expected result based on the characteristic of First Borns that are deliberate and have a planned approach to life. Also, the women's first scale was predicted by the need for achievement and social recognition also dominance, which seems to be a theme with First Borns. In the Youngest position scores reflecting exhibition were supported. In these two studies caution is advised since they are exploratory in nature but a general furtherance in understanding that psychological birth order, family atmosphere and personality are related.

Eckstein (2000) identified 151 empirically based studies reflecting significant birth order characteristics. In each study, characteristics of Oldest, Middle and Youngest were looked at and categorized. Examples for each are; Oldest - high achievers, conformist to parental values, easiest influenced by authority, self discipline; Middle - sociable, greatest feeling of not belonging, relates well to older and younger people; Youngest- sympathetic, most popular, high self esteem, spoiled. These are descriptors that we have heard before that we can associate with personality and birth order.

Research conducted in Malaysia with a personality inventory based on Adler's birth order positions (Sidek Personality Inventory) found certain
dominate trait patterns although no significant relations existed between birth order and personality traits (Tharbe and Harun, 2000). In a study conducted on adopted cohorts and rearing order, rearing order exerts very little influence on personality (Beer and Horn, 2000). The data showed a weak connection to Sulloway’s conclusions and the big "5" personality traits; neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness.

Leman’s research on birth order personality characteristics supports Adler’s findings in most respects. Leman (2000) reports that oldest borns tend to be conscientious, well organized, serious, goal-oriented achieving believers in authority, reliable, perfectionists and self-reliant. He also states that these seemingly positive, motivated characteristics that help the oldest child to succeed academically and professionally are the same characteristics that damage close relationships they have with others. Leman (2000) disagrees in some respect with Adler when it comes to the characteristics and reputation of only children. Leman (2000) says that only children tend to be confident, perfectionist, organized, ambitious, logical and scholarly. Though only children can be self-centered, it is not to the extreme that the existing stereotypes indicate. Furthermore, only children take some of these traits, namely perfectionism, into their interpersonal relationships. These results in high expectations for anyone an only child comes in contact with. Middle children have a list of contradictory personality characteristics: loner/sociable, impatient/laid-back, and aggressive/conflict-avoider. This suggests that middle children do not have a certain list of general characteristics like the other birth orders. Leman (2000) did say that middle children tend to be mediators and are choosy about which they confide in. Middle children also are one of the most monogamous birth orders, who are motivated to make their marriages and families work. Middle children also tend to have the fewer problems than first-born/only children. All of these qualities deal with their relationships with people. Youngest children tend to be
charming, people-oriented, tenacious, and affectionate and attention seeking. They also tend to just “do” things – without thinking about the consequences of their actions. This is a trait that would come into play during relationships as well (Leman 2000).

Conversely, a variety of studies have been done to determine the effect of birth order on marriage partners. Leman’s (2000) research suggests the ideal and not so ideal birth order pairs for long-term romantic relationships. Leman (2000) has found that the absolute worst birth order pairs are those within the same birth order (e.g., two first-borns/onlys, two middles, or two youngest). He says that two first-borns together equal a lifelong power struggle. Leman (2000) also says that two middles are a bad match because communication will be lacking due to avoidance of conflict, a natural trait of middle children (as discussed earlier). Leman (2000) also says two babies are not a great match because youngest children usually do not delegate responsibilities well, and assume that someone else will pick up the slack. If there are two people that are both assuming the other will pick up the duties at home, then the household will more than likely fall apart. According to Leman (2000), it is best to marry outside your birth order. On top of that, it is best to marry the most opposite birth order position.

This research is meant to add research to the existing literature on birth order’s effect on romantic partners (both successful and unsuccessful). However, the research is unique in that it is examining the effect of birth order on friendship as well, which is a less studied area. In order to study the effect of birth order on interpersonal relationships, a fifteen-item survey was distributed, asking the participants about their birth order and about the birth orders of people they have or have had interpersonal relationships with (see appendices A & B). This researcher’s conceptual hypothesis says that the types of relationships
people form are affected by birth order. Five operational hypotheses are examined in this study: First, if an individual reports having a close friendship with someone of the same sex, then that person will report that he/she and the friend have the same/similar birth order; Second, if an individual reports having a close platonic friendship with someone of the opposite sex, then that friend will be reported as having the same/similar birth order as the participant; Third, if an individual reports having a successful romantic relationship with someone, then that romantic partner will be reported as having an opposing, but compatible birth order than that of the participant; Fourth, if an individual reports having been divorced, then that person will report that he/she and the divorced person will have the same/similar birth order positions; And, fifth, not counting the divorce, if a person reports having had an unsuccessful romantic significant romantic relationship (that has lasted at least two years), then that person will report that he/she and the ex-romantic partner have similar birth order positions. All of these hypotheses are consistent with Leman’s (2000) research on ideal marriage partners for the various birth orders and Gillies’ (1974) research on friendships.

Given the differences in family dynamics involved in birth order, it is not surprising that firstborns and later-born have different characteristics (Rodgers, 2000). First-born children are more adult-oriented, helpful, conforming, anxious, and self-controlled than their siblings. Parents give more attention to firstborns and this is related, to firstborns’ nurturing behavior (Stanhope & Corter, 1993). Parental demands and high standards established for firstborns result in these children’s excelling in academic and professional endeavors. Firstborns are over represented in Who’s Who and Rhodes scholars, for example. However, some of the same pressures placed on firstborns for high achievement may be the reason they also have more guilt, anxiety, and difficulty in coping, with stressful situations, as well as higher admission to child guidance clinics.
Paulhus, Trapnell and Chen (1999) investigated birth order effects on personality and achievement in four studies. The studies were self-reports on about others and themselves in the family. In one of the studies they manipulated the knowledge of the birth order, and in two of the studies it was a take home packet that asked the participants to rank all family members on all variables. Across all diverse data sets First Borns were nominated as most achieving and contentious. Later Borns were nominated as most rebellious, liberal and agreeable (Paulhas, Trapnell & Chen, 1999). Overall, the results support the theories of Sulloway's and Adler's of personality development.

Parents tend to perceive oldest children as most intelligent and strong, and often give them more control over their environment than younger children. This has been associated with a controlling outlook in adulthood and obsession with rules and regulation (Buckley, 1998). Birth order characteristics may manifest differently for males and females. Parents tend to be more restrictive with a first child due to the anxiety of not knowing how to deal with a new baby, and towards females in general, who is believed to receive harsher socialization than males in many societies (Boling, Boling & Eisenman, 1993).

Johanna Crosby, (1998) viewed the first-born child, tends to walk and talk earlier. More serious, responsible and loyal to parents' values and standards.

May be a perfectionist; highly critical of himself or herself or others. Dominant, assertive and conscientious. An expert procrastinator, which counterbalances perfectionist tendencies.

A natural high achiever. Scholarly, logical, goal-oriented and status-conscious. Well-organized; neurotic.

Accepts authority, supports law and order and is inclined to be a conservative. Attracted to high-achievement occupations.
Career Track: Doctors, lawyers, industry leaders, journalists, engineers, accountants, architects, executive secretaries, computer programmers and bookkeepers.

Johanna Crosby, (1998) viewed the last-born child to be, many be manipulative; uses charm to get his or her way. Sociable, attention seeking, a showoff and a people person inclined to blame others. Precocious, engaging, affectionate, rebellious, absent-minded, And Critical and control seeking, like firstborn, but more agreeable and open to new experiences, Temperamental, spoiled, impatient and tenacious. Needs to make an important contribution Gravitates toward professions that are people-self or performance-oriented, Careers: Actor, newspaper reporter, talk show host, comedian, psychologist, telephone solicitor, salesperson, disc jockey, TV announcer, entertainer, counselor, teachers.

Johanna Crosby, (1998) viewed the middle born child to be, least understood of all birth orders. Unsure of his or her role in the family mediator and willing to compromise: Friendly, sociable and free-spirited, Loyal to peers, and has many friends, Makes the best mate. Independent, maverick tendencies, Tends to leave the nest soonest. Less fearful and anxious than firstborns, Secretive and power-oriented Career Track: Entrepreneur, social worker, mediator, middle manager, real estate agent.

Youngest children are supposedly more able to successfully pace themselves against older siblings without experiencing psychological exhaustion as the middle children may encounter (Buckley, 1998). They are thought to develop good social skills fostered by constant peer interaction. Individuals occupying this position in family dynamics have been found to be secure, yet dependent, which has been attributed to having many caretakers throughout
childhood. Difficulty in establishing autonomy has been observed in adulthood, with accompanying feelings of inferiority and concerns that they are not regarded seriously (Richardson & Richardson, 1990). This is compounded by the realization that throughout childhood everyone else was stronger, older and more competent, and the worry that they can never compete on equal footing (Ernst & Angst, 1983).

Birth order personalities are thought to be formed early in life. As siblings mature, each one selects a niche in the family constellation. As each progressive sibling chooses a niche, the younger children select different ones. This niche selection process has been used to explain the differences in traits and personality characteristics that siblings display (Buckley, 1998). Children have to solve particular obstacles presented to them by the position in the family that they occupy, by using a set of coping skills, which then become birth order characteristics. For example, an only child may have to reconcile dealing with loneliness and intrusion (Isaacson, 1997).

The second born never expects complete parental attention, supposedly fostering greater cooperation. The stereotype of a neglected middle child may have some basis. This may be an internalized sense of lack of a specific role in the family, and difficulty finding a unique identity, especially after being displaced by a third born child (Buckley, 1998). However it may foster greater resilience to stressors, as well as diplomacy in dealing with a variety of personalities in attempts to negotiate potentially domineering older siblings, and attention-stealing younger siblings. It has been suggested that middle children may become the least anxious (Willem et al., 1972 in Ernst & Angst, 1983), harmonious, leisurely and extraverted individuals (Konig, 1963 in Ernst & Angst, 1983).
Lastborns are generally considered to be the family "baby" throughout their lives. Because of nurturing from many older family members and the example of their siblings, lastborns from large families tend to develop strong social and coping skills and may even be able to reach some milestones earlier. As a group, they have been found to be the most successful socially and to have the highest self-esteem of all the birth positions.

What does the research say about specific career areas and birth order? White, et al (1997), found these trend; oldest child scores were significantly related to the social and business contact areas. The more the individual identifies with the need to strive for perfection and please others, the greater interest he/she may express in socially oriented careers requiring interpersonal abilities. The Youngest child is less interested in science and the technical, they stay away from the fields that stress concrete or data driven perspectives. The Middle child tends to express vocational interest around ideas rather than data.

Further studies have been done that examine the effects of birth order on other factors. Most of the research did not relate directly to interpersonal relationships. However they all related to a specific factor in a relationship. A study done by Buunk (1997) examined relationships between jealousy, personality and attachment styles. This study found that later borns were more jealous than firstborns. Furthermore, since all other variables were controlled, birth order was the only factor left with which to associate feelings of jealousy (Buunk 1997). Another study completed by Bryce and Schwebel (1996), examined birth order, gender and irrational relationship beliefs. Surprisingly, Bryce and Schwebel found that oldest children have the highest number of irrational beliefs, while youngest have the least amount. Gender, in this case, had no effect.
Schultz D.P. & Schultz S.E. (1996) Adler found the second child to be ambitious, rebellious, and jealous, constantly striving to surpass the first-born. (Adler was a second-born and had a lifelong competitive relationship with his older brother, whose name was Sigmund). Adler considered the second-born to be better adjusted than the first-born or the youngest child. He believed the youngest child in the family to be spoiled and the one most likely to have behavior problem in childhood and adulthood. Schultz D.P & Schultz S.E. (1996) in examining the childhoods of his patients, Adler becomes interested in the relationship between personality and order of birth. He found that the oldest, middle, and youngest child, because of their positions in the family, has different social experiences that result in different personalities. The oldest child receives a great deal of attention until dethroned by the birth of the second child. The first-born may then become insecure and hostile, authoritarian and conservative, with a strong interest in maintaining order. Adler suggested that criminals, neurotics, and perverts are often first-born children. (Sigmund Freud was a first-born).

Sulloway (1996) points out that Later Borns have been more likely than First Borns to challenge the status quo. They are looked upon as more rebellious and risk taking. In a study looking at civil disobedience Zweigenhaft and Von Ammon looked at birth order position and number of arrests for protesting. They found that 24 out of 56 (43%) who had not been arrested were Later Borns, that 6 of the 12 (50%) who had been arrested once were Later Borns and that all 5 (100%) who had been arrested more than once were all Later Borns (Zweigenhaft & Von Ammon, 2000). The small study shows some evidence to the rebellious characteristic of Later Borns.

However, numerical place in a family may not correspond to psychological birth order, or prompt development of particular archetypal characteristics that have been associated with a certain ordinal birth position.
Birth order assessed according to numerical position has revealed contradictory findings in most areas that have been investigated (Ernst & Angst, 1983), potentially obscuring any true effects that may be due to the dynamics created by family constellation (Sulloway, 1996).

Sulloway's (1996) suggesting that first-borns are more likely to identify with parents and have strong motivation to satisfy parental expectations. Further, first-borns are more assertive and jealous in order to preserve valued parental resources.

Sulloway's (1996) further suggested that later-born, on the other hand, are more likely to be agreeable in order to reduce any possible threatening confrontations with their older and stronger siblings and are more rebellious/adventurous to facilitate the pursuit of alternative strategies for parental investment. Further he says more specifically, we predicted that first-born will be rated as more dominant than later-born and later born as more sociable than first-borns.

In Adlerian terms, a child is usually seen within the social structure of the family (Utay & Utay, 1996), however Adlerian theory purports that a child's situation should be regarded from the individual's perspective (Utay & Utay, 1996). Although criticized as an ad hoc addition to the investigation of how birth order may affect personality characteristics, a psychological birth order has been introduced to accommodate this Adlerian premise. In the instance that a second born child consistently outshines a weak or slow first born, he or she may assume the traits that Adler ascribed to the oldest child. The two then switch roles within family dynamics (Buckley, 1998), and the ordinal and psychological birth order characteristics differ. Responses to stress will then be characterized by the psychological birth order characteristics the individual has assumed.
Stewart and Stewart (1995) have complied data on the trend of birth order research from 1976 -1993. They looked at 1011 studies, dissertations and thesis and have assembled a list of the topics that were most frequently studied. Included in the list are the areas of achievement, parent-child interaction, intelligence, personality, cross culture and psychopathology. These six topics represent 47% of the 1011 published studies (Stewart & Stewart, 1995). Over the last 20 years there has been a decline in the number of studies done regarding birth order, however the number of published pages has been consistent (Stewart & Stewart, 1995). This lends support that researchers are still interested in the subject but are looking at doing higher quality studies. Several researchers (Campbell, Sidek) have designed their own personality inventories, which are closely related to Adler's defined birth positions, to see if they can get more consistent results in the data.

The review of the literature for this research will include the broader areas of birth order bias, risk taking and rebellious behavior, achievement/career and birth order, birth order and intelligence/learning, birth order and relationships and then the more specific references to this study, birth order and personality traits.

Parental expectations, children learn to do certain things in certain roles by what their parents encourage (Parks, 1995). The parent's treatment of each child is different based on the bias of birth order. The parents perceive each spot in the family in a particular way and their response and guidance of each child is influenced by that position. From the beginning the oldest is expected to tow the line and set good examples and the youngest is babied. This bias sets down the basis of the child's perceived experiences in the family.

Not only in the family may bias influence treatment but also in a clinical setting. Alan Stewart's (1995) reported that manipulated birth order was effective
in influencing the participants to develop impressions of the client that were consistent with the prototypical characteristics of each birth position. In other words, when the counselor knew the birth position of the clinical client, the outcome of their impression of the client corresponded to the general characteristics in Adler's birth position theory. It can be theorized that their impressions were biased by the fact of birth position.

Birth order may play a role in how a child, it can also play a role in how much education the child pursues. Birth order was found to have an impact on total years of education completed among the middle class. Only children appear to excel in terms of education attainment (Travis, 1995) and a study by Astin sited in Williams (1983) stated that 47% of women possessing a doctorate degree in the United States were First Borns.

Can group affiliation be affected by birth order position? This concept was looked at by Nelson and Harris and their findings were that First Born females did not score significantly higher on the affiliation measure nor were they found to be more group oriented than Later Borns (Nelson & Harris, 1995). The only significant finding was birth order and belonging to an organization. First Borns were found to hold membership in significantly more organizations than Later Borns. If First Borns are characterized by achievement driven behavior, this evidence lend some support to the "big picture" which is that birth order does affect personality characteristics.

Perception, Nelson & Harris (1995) researcher finds that this is a main concept in birth order research. Birth order positions and characteristic can be mapped out and studied in empirical ways but it is the perception, that each participant brings to the research, which is being measured. If we gather enough evidence of what the perceptions are, does that make it true? This could be the
reason that we see a lot of inconsistency in the birth order research when it comes to a predictor of personality.

People attempt to discover the causes of other's behavior. They want to attribute their good or poor performance to something that is either internal - within the person or external - environment. Society tends to look internal attributes for success and failure. Does birth order play a role in making judgments about causes of others behavior? Phillips and Phillips (1994) found that First Borns attribute more responsibility for past good or poor performance to internal factors of the applicant whose data was reviewed and first born managers may be more likely than Later Borns to hire a candidate whose past good performance is attributed to the person's efforts. Due to their experiences, their own personality and internal motivation, First Borns generalize their characteristics to other people. When reflecting on instances of their own good performance, First Borns (including only) made stronger internal self-attributes than Later Borns (Phillips & Phillips, 2000). First Borns see themselves as in control and responsible for their performance. There has been some support that achievement motivational patterns vary according to birth order position (Watkins, 1992).

One aspect of intelligence is learning. Can knowing the birth order of the students help facilitate learning in the classroom? Morales (1994) states that birth order theory can be used to help in classroom cooperative learning. Teachers can balance the child's designated role in the group with the child's characteristics that are based on birth order theory. From their perspective, students expect teachers to act like parents and classmates to behave in the same way as their siblings. Behavior patterns learned at home are then transferred to the classroom. In cooperative learning, a group of students complete the task. If each child is assigned their role based on the role they play in their family, they may have an
easier time fulfilling their role in the group task. The more the teacher knows about his/her students and their abilities to learn the more he/she can assist them. Birth order theory can be used to give the teacher a psychological frame of reference to assist them in understanding the children in the classroom (Romeo, 1994). Each birth position has positive and negative values. Teachers can use these qualities to help build rapport with the student and to learn what style of teaching may be most beneficial to the student.

Birth order is special interest of sibling researchers. When differences in birth order are found, they usually are explained by variations in interactions with parents and siblings associated with the unique experiences of being in a particular position in the family. This is especially true in the case of the first-born child (Teti & et al, 1993). Parents have higher expectations for first-born children than for later-born children. They put more pressure on them for achievement and responsibility. They also interfere more with their activities (Rothbart, 1971).

The research has also looked at specifically women's career interest and birth order. Some of the findings are inconsistent with White et al, Bohmer and Sitton found Later Borns to select careers in science and women writers are more likely to be First Borns. Youngest were significantly more likely to become performing artist (Bohmer & Sitton, 1993). This trend highlights the youngest characteristic of wanting to be the center of attention.

Second born children are often expected to become more successful in innovative endeavors because their position requires competition against the first arrival (Bohmer & Sitton, 1993). The first born is the pace setter, and the second born must labour to keep up. This may instill a constant competitive drive (Bohmer & Sitton, 1993). Their earliest memories may be dominated by older,
bigger, stronger and more advanced siblings. Catching up could become a main
goal. Alternatively, setting high goals in a niche unoccupied by an older sibling
may be a strategy adopted by a middle child. Unchecked, competitiveness may
develop into restlessness or neuroticism (Richardson & Richardson, 1990).

Youngest children may feel weak and helpless because they compare
themselves with older siblings who are able to do more things physically and
socially. They may feel that they always have more growing up to do in order to
have the privileges they see their older siblings have. Some lastborns develop
self-esteem problems if older siblings or parents take power away from these
lastborns so that they cannot make decisions or take responsibility. Because of
this powerlessness, some lastborns may be grandiose, with big plans that never
work out.

Birth order, sex of siblings and self-ratings of interpersonal power were
examined in a study done by Todd, Friedman and Steele (1993). Their findings
were that older sisters of younger brothers rated themselves as very high in
power. Younger sisters of older brothers rated themselves as very low in power
(Todd, Friedman and Steele 1993). This research suggests that any given birth
order’s perception of interpersonal power will be carried over into that
individual’s interpersonal relationships. An additional study done by Phillips,
Long and Bedeian (1991) looked at Type A status and birth order. They found
that oldest and only children score higher on Type A status than the other birth
orders. This, too, could affect relationships with people among various birth
orders. One final study, which also supports the effects of birth order, was done
by Harris and Morrow (1992). They examined birth order and gender as it relates
to responsibility and dominance. Oldest males and youngest females had higher
dominance scores than the rest of the birth orders. The factor of dominance could
affect interpersonal relationships as well (Harris & Morrow 1992).
Most of the birth order studies are self-reports; this may be one of the factors that cause the discrepancies in the research. Looking at responsibility and dominance as personality traits, no main effect was found for birth order (Harris and Morrow, 1992). First Borns did not have a higher score on responsibility or dominance than Later Borns. Gender had a larger effect than birth order, where female saw themselves as more responsible than oldest born males. Oldest born males had higher dominance scores than oldest females but youngest females had significant higher scores than youngest males. Also no significance was found between the two personality dimensions of extroversion introversion and neuroticism as part of birth order (Farley, 1975), and the same results were found in a self-report on perceived personality, there was no significance between traits of extroversion, neuroticism and openness in First Borns (Jefferson, Herbst and McCrae, 1998). Jefferson et al did find a small effect for First Borns who's scores were lower as compared to Last Borns on altruism and tenderness. First Borns saw themselves as more hard headed and self-centered than Later Borns. When peers did the rating of others, they rated their Later Born peers higher in openness and agreeability. This evidence suggests that birth order may have subtle effects on personality as reported both in self-reports and observer rated reports.

You would expect to find that among dangerous leisure time activities i.e. skydiving, rock climbing; you would find more Later Borns than First Borns based on general findings of previous studies. However inconsistency is a common barrier found in birth order research. Steff, Grecas, Frey (1992) found no relationship between birth order and risky leisure activities among members of the US Parachute Association. Yet Sohl & Yusuff (1991) found Later Borns choose more dangerous sports. Inconsistencies such as these fuel the fire for continued studies in the social psychology field.
In a review of the literature, Eisenman (1992) concluded that first-born is more fearful, and that some first-born show more anxiety and creativity. These findings may be due to parents being more restrictive and anxious with first-borns as well as to first-borns having more time alone with their parents.

Transition to parenthood is a major life event with long-term consequences for individuals in families (Kalmuss & Davidson, 1992). Perhaps the most important opportunity for discrepancies between expectations of parenthood and experiences with child-rearing, Occurs after the birth of the first child. These discrepancies between expectations and experiences may affect the ease of adjustment to parenthood. Experiences that are more negative than expected may be associated with a more difficult adjustment. This framework is based on the notion that it is not the nature of experiences, alone which affect evaluations of experiences. Rather the evaluations are shaped by how experiences match expectations (Heider, 1958; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978 in Kalmuss & Davidson, 1992). Thus difficult parenting experiences that were anticipated may be associated with reports of easier adjustment to parenthood than such experiences that were unanticipated (Kalmuss & Davidson, 1992). Empirically, mothers' inflated expectancies were found not to match actual experiences at one-year post birth, on relationship with spouses, friends, and physical wellbeing, maternal competence and care giving assistance from spouses (Kalmuss & Davidson, 1992). High expectations might make transition more difficult because they are difficult to meet, while the reverse may be true for low expectations (Kalmuss & Davidson, 1992).

Rice F.P. (1992) Middle children tend to have lower self-esteem than do firstborn and last born, probably because they have a less well-defined function within the family. The middle children are somewhat overlooked. They are not special because of being the first, nor are they the last. They are there, and
accepted as they are, but usually do not receive as much special attention as the oldest or the youngest child.

In another study, *Harris and Morrow* (1992) found first-born males to be more dominant than first-born females, but the opposite was true for last-born. *Kaplan* (1970) found, however, that last-born males (white, high SES) were more likely to have higher self-esteem than middle, and only children.

Regarding emotional stability, Kaur & Dheer found that middle-born are more emotionally stable while first- and later-born are more neurotic. Another study, however, found no birth order effect on neuroticism or extroversion (*Shaughnessy, Neely, Manz, & Nystul, 1990*).

There are studies involving birth order, which indicate no significant results. One such study was done by *Angira* (1990) on birth order, family structure and adjustment. The results indicated that there was no significant interaction between family structure and birth order. However, this study did say the birth order and family structure significantly impacted adjustment. The way in which birth order impacted these factors was not specified.

*Leman k.* (1985) stated middle born is Mediator, fewest pictures in the family photo album, avoids conflict, independent, extreme loyalty to the peer group, many friends. If there are a large number of children, middle children will form “alliances” in their striving for superiority. They may identify with one or more siblings and develop similar traits. Although it is difficult to find an “outstanding” identity as a middle child, many appear to take the challenge and create a clear, strong unique identity as they are given the freedom to shape their own personalities more than other birth orders.
First and only children may seek out personal interaction as a response to distress more than individuals of other birth order positions according to early work in the field (Schachter, 1959 in Falbo, 1984). This was attributed to more attentive response to the child’s distress (Falbo, 1984), presumably leading to the expectation that significant others will be comforting in times of distress (Falbo, 1984). New mothers generally respond more quickly to the distress of a first child and are slower to respond to later born children. Perhaps first borns may be more likely than their later born siblings to associate anxiety with affiliation, or comfort from others (Ernst & Angst, 1983).

Leman Kevin (1985) observed that the last-born are Manipulative, charming, blames others, shows off, people person, good salesperson, precocious. According to Romeo (1994) a child’s position in the family greatly determines their personality characteristics. “The influence of the family constellation in so strong that the lifestyles of the youngest children of two different families are more similar than those of the youngest and middle child of the same family.” Travis and Kohli (1995) support the birth order theory by mentioning that intellectual destiny is influenced by the sibling situation into which one is born. Amber Esping (2003) reported that later born children are more likely to become revolutionary leaders and scientists, and they may in fact be more creative than their firstborn siblings (Sulloway, 1996; 1999; Simonton, 1984/1999, 1999).

Middle children can feel forgotten or overlooked because of the attention or demands of either the firstborns or the lastborns. Some of these children never seem to find their place in the social order, and they try to rebel or misbehave in order to draw attention to themselves. Some of these troubled middle children bully younger siblings or children at school. Other middle children capitalize on the injustice they feel as children and become trial lawyers or social activists because such roles allow them to fight against other social injustices. Some
middle borns become very socially skilled because they have learned to negotiate and compromise daily with their siblings and their parents. Some of these children are often called the peacemakers of the household.

Bloom, Anderson, and Hazaleus (1984) found that neither age spacing nor gender had an effect on anxiety or locus of control of first-borns in two-child families. Furthermore, Anantharman (1981) found no difference in the anxiety levels of first-borns and later-born. However, Gates, Limberger, Crockett, and Hubbard (1988) reported first-borns as having less trait anxiety with girls exhibiting more anxiety than did boys overall. Haworth (1981) replicated this finding. The assertion that the oldest in the family will be the most anxious because first-time parents are more anxious themselves is not supported by these studies. Shanbhag (1990), however, found that first-borns were more anxious than both middle-and last-born, and Kushnir (1978), while finding no birth order effect on trait anxiety, did conclude that first-born females might show higher state anxiety than later-born females.

Ernst and Angst (1983) stated that First Borns and Later Borns may indeed develop different patterns of behavior, but they may behave that way only in the presence of parents - parent specific personality. The similar concept of context specific learning (Harris, 2000) avows that people do not automatically transfer behavior from one context to another. Patterns of behavior acquired in the family tend to be inappropriate or useless in other settings. Outside the family, First Borns and Later Borns are indistinguishable in personality.

Ernst and Angst (1983) developed research that examined the importance of the sex of the siblings. This study proposed the imitation hypothesis and the contrast hypothesis (Ernst & Angst 1983). In the imitation hypothesis, the researchers expected the child with an opposite sex sibling to develop
characteristics of that opposite sex (e.g., a girl with a brother will be less feminine than a girl with a sister). The contrast hypothesis argued that the opposite-sex sibling would strongly reinforce stereotypical gender roles (e.g., a girl with a brother will be more feminine than a girl with a sister). This is an important factor in determining the formation of close friendships (Ernst & Angst 1983).

Snow Jaklin. And Maccoby. (1981) Found that sociability, as well as assertiveness in frustrating situations, was highest in only children, second highest in first-borns, and lowest in later-born. Yet Bell et al. (1985) found that birth order had no effect on social competence. Others, similarly, found no differences in sociability between the birth categories, but found the oldest to be the dominant (similar to ascendancy factor measured by GPP) birth category (Perlin & Grater, 1984; Phillips, Bedeian, Mossholder & Toulilatos, 1988).

Although dethronement is frequently cited in case histories of children referred for psychiatric intervention, and a high incidence of behavioural problems are noted for dethroned older siblings, there is disagreement among mental health professionals about how much this event can be viewed as an instigator of psychopathology since it is a challenge that many children encounter (Dunn & Kendrick, 1982).

Research on aggression and exhibition found that last-borns scored highest on need exhibition while middle-borns scored highest on need aggression (Begum, Banu, Jahan & Begum 1981). First-borns, on the other hand, scored lowest on both exhibition and aggression. Gender was also a factor here with need exhibition for first-borns and middle-born being stronger with males than with females. For last-born, need exhibition was stronger with females than with males.
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Rathus S.A. (1981) Second-born children, on the other hand, tend to be more extraverted, or outgoing, and to have better sense of humor (Thompson 1974). The middle child has many of the characteristics of the second child but is often plagued by feelings of parental neglect, inadequacy and inferiority. Middle children tend to crave demonstrations of affections, a sign of insecurity. They often have difficulty defining a personality for themselves in relationship to the older siblings that will give them the attention and affection they need. It is difficult for the middle child to establish a strong power base in the family. They tend to feel they are not loved as much and can never be better than their older siblings at any thing they try. Many middle children in their “striving for superiority” do find a unique way to become “center stage” at times and develop unique talents. Often however they still do not feel as important or valued as their older siblings.

In contrast, Walter and Ziegler (1980) found middle-born to have a more internal locus of control than first-or later-born in families of three or more. They also found last-born in larger families to show a more external locus of control than last-born from smaller families. Harris and Morrow (1992) found that birth order had no effect on self-perception of responsibility. Kirkcaldy (1992), similarly, concluded that birth-order has no effect on the work attitudes of college students.

There are many ways to measure personality in the field of psychology. In this research alone there has been use of the MMPI, Sidek Inventory, BASIS-A inventory, Howarth Personality questionnaire (Howarth, 1980 which found First Borns to have the highest superego rating) and others designed by the researchers of each study. The last two research studies that will be discussed used the White-Campbell Birth Order
Craig G.J. (1979) reported that Later-born children have an easier life than first borns in some ways. Their parents are more relaxed; they have been through all the worries of childrearing, so they know that a baby will walk eventually, or that he will outgrow the habit of pulling other children’s hair (McArthur, 1956; Sears, 1950). But parents cannot give exclusive attention to more than one child. As a result, the younger children do not have the same benefit of direct tutelage from experienced adults. Instead, much of their learning comes from observing the unpredictable and less sophisticated models of their siblings. Therefore, while younger children may talk later and be less achievement-oriented, they tend to be more at ease with other children and more comfortable in social situations (Bossard & Boll, 1955; McArthur, 1956; Sears, 1950).

The PBOI instrument of measure was developed to define the four-birth order positions described by Adler. The inventory has forty questions ten questions for each of the four positions (Oldest, Middle, Youngest and Only). The questions were developed from the literature on the differential characteristics of birth order. Chapter three will discuss the validity and reliability of the inventory. This inventory is the instrument that will be used in the current study, so the researcher gave more significance to the following two studies.

Kushnir (1978) found that birth-order differences in affiliation exist only in females and only in situations that produce higher anxiety (similar to emotional stability as measured by the GPP) in first-born than in later-born females. This finding suggests that the purpose of affiliation for first-born females is to reduce anxiety. Schachter (1959) concluded that first born and only children become more anxious in anxiety-inducing situations than later-borns, and when anxious, is also more likely to seek company then later-born.
The other side of the birth order coin is that it does have a major influence on our perceptions of our place in the world and the personality traits we develop to cope in the family atmosphere and into living outside the family. The view of this researcher is that of Adler's, that there is evidence that our perceptions will lead us to obtain certain personality traits. Individuals interact with their world based on their own assumptions. These assumptions are usually influenced by birth order and affect the kinds of perceptions he/she develops. Adler speaks of general patterns of behavior for birth positions. There have been findings that support Adler's contentions. Croake and Olson looked at Adler's view of birth order. They used the 10 basic scales of the MMPI to evaluate their participants. Their general findings were; Oldest and Youngest males scored significantly higher on most of the MMPI scales than did Middle born males. (Croake & Olson, 1977). These finding support one of Adler's contentions about birth position that is that Oldest and Youngest children are more likely to have difficulty in development due to rivalry and lack of cooperation in the family (Adler, 1958).

Campbell, White, & Stewart looked at the relationship between psychological birth order, defined as the way the child locate or perceive themselves in the family structure (Shulman & Mosak, 1977) to actual birth order. These perceived positions, Oldest, Middle, Youngest, Only, have been described by Adler and have been supported in the literature over time (Dreikurs & Soltz, 1964; Pepper, 1964; Sweeney, 1981). Using the PBOI, the results of the study indicate a significant relationship between the 556 participants' actual birth order and psychological birth order. (Campbell, White and Stewart 1991). The distribution into each category is as follows; 40.2% of all the oldest children corresponded to the psychologically oldest category, Middle child, 28.4% corresponded to the appropriate psychological position and 45.7% of the actual Youngest corresponded to the psychologically youngest category.
In studies comparing maternal psychological states before and after the birth of a first child, many new mothers were found to be overly anxious (Ounsted & Hendrick, 1977). Feeding problems, ill health of the neonate, sleep disturbances and difficulty in establishing a routine were implicated (Ounsted & Hendrick, 1977).

Same-sex and platonic friendships have not been researched as often, specifically with birth order as a determining factor. One theory was researched regarding friendship versus romantic relationships (Gillies 1976). Gillies stated that when a relationship is not platonic, then the relationship focuses on differences; however, when that relationship is strictly of a friendship nature, where sexuality is outside of it, then the people in that relationship are focusing on similarities.

A fifth kind of evidence for the influence of environmental factors is provided by research on birth order and intelligence. Several studies report that first-borns tend to have higher IQs than second-born, who tend to have higher IQs than third-born, and so on (Zajonc & Markus, 1975). The differences are not large-only a few IQ points at most—but they do seem to be real. Why do such differences exist? One possibility is suggested by confluence theory, a theory proposed by Zajonc (1975, 1986). According to confluence theory, each individual’s intellectual growth depends to an important degree on the intellectual environment in which he or she develops. A first-born child benefits from the fact that for some period of time, until the birth of another child, he or she lives with two adults who provide a relatively advantaged intellectual environment.

The Confluence Model proposed by R.B. Zajonc & Markus (1975) and Zajonc (1976, 2001) explains the firstborn IQ advantage in terms of the ever-
changing intellectual environment within the family. It uses a simple mathematical formula to compute the relative advantages and disadvantages of these factors:

1. Firstborns do not have to share their parents’ attention, so they benefit from their parents’ complete absorption in the new responsibility. Later-born children never experience this advantage. Moreover, additional siblings automatically limit the amount of attention any of the siblings get and this includes the firstborn. This would explain the Belmont and Marolla (1973) finding that firstborns from smaller families have higher IQs than firstborns from larger families.

2. Firstborn children are exposed to more adult language. Later-born are exposed to the less mature speech of their siblings. This may affect their performance on the verbal scales of intelligence tests. Moreover, the linguistic environment becomes increasingly less mature as more children enter the family. This also gels with the finding that children in larger families have lower IQ scores.

3. As more children enter the family, the general intellectual environment becomes less mature. This would explain why firstborns and older children from large families have lower IQ than firstborn and older children from smaller families.

4. Firstborns (and older sibling’s kin general) often have to answer questions and explain things to their younger siblings. It is believed that the act of tutoring helps the older children to cognitively process information. Further, teaching others may improve their verbal abilities. Except in very rare cases, youngest siblings do not get the opportunity to tutor their
brothers and sisters. This tutoring function explains why only children do not tend to have higher IQs than firstborns.

The first-born has an indeterminate period of access to parental attention, unencumbered by sibling interjection (Altus, 1972). Dethronement, a first born's experience upon the birth of a younger sibling, has become a popularised concept. Parental interaction with first-born two year olds has been found to become more vigilant, less playful and more strained following the arrival of a sibling (Feiring, Lewis & Jaskir, 1983). According to a psychoanalytic view, distress instigated by this experience causes the older child much jealousy and bitterness, which are often repressed and may manifest as adulthood insecurity (Falbo, 1984). It is generally agreed that there is some dethronement effect, but its strength and duration are not agreed upon. Subsequent offspring may also experience some distress when another child is born into the family (Ernst & Angst, 1983).

Most research on the possible effects of birth order has concentrated on identifying personal characteristics that vary as a function of ordinal position. Many reports have concluded with conjecture about the effects of differing socialization experiences for children of different ordinal positions. However few studies have observed actual behaviour of parents towards children of differencing birth order (Rothbart, 1972). The reports of greater academic achievement attained by first borns (Morjoribanks, 1997) has led to questions about the effects of parental expectations and pressures for success exerted upon the first born compared to subsequent children (Rothbart, 1972). Parents with no referent for childhood achievement may set an unnaturally high standard for performance from their first born (Rothbart, 1972). This may instill a greater drive to achieve in the child, and anxiety of inability to live up to parental expectations. If internalized, this chronic anxiety may alter habitual response to
stress. Alternatively, realization that parental expectations are unattainable may result in compromised self esteem (Ernst & Angst, 1983), also a risk factor for succumbing to negative effects of stressors. Later borns, who strive for more attainable models, set by their older siblings, may have less conditional self esteem (Sampson, 1965; De Avila, 1971 in Ernst & Angst, 1983). Later borns may become more flexible and open to change, as they must compete for parental attention. This could foster an innovative strategy for coping with stressors (Gould, 1997).

Many second borns are also middle children. They often report feeling inferior to older children because they do not possess their sibling’s advanced abilities. Sometimes, they are very competitive with their firstborn sibling. Others choose to focus their energies in areas different from those in which their older sibling is already established. This competition with firstborns drives second borns and middle borns to innovation, doing or being different from their older siblings in order to make themselves stand out in the family dynamic. In truth, they often are more competent at an earlier age than their older siblings because they have had their example to follow.

In one study, Hilton (1967) had three groups of four-year-old children work a series of puzzles. The groups consisted of (1) only children (2) first born with a young sibling, and (3) later born. Hilton found that firstborn and only children were significantly more likely to run to mother for help between tests even though told not to leave their seat. Firstborn also tended to seek the reassurance or approval of others more often than later-born children.

Rogers D. (1967, 1977) Second and middle children are apparently better adjusted than the oldest. They are spared much of the parental anxiety experienced by the first; and since the mother feels more confident and less tense,
a more relaxed mother-child relationship exists. In consequence, the second-born is fewer neurotics and introverted more fun loving, easy-going, humorous, and placid (Thompson, 1974). However, if they use the first child as a pacemaker, and cannot keep up, they may feel inadequate.

Rogers D. (1967, 1977) concluded that the youngest child occupies a relatively secure position. The youngest is pampered by parents and older siblings and often has more than one older sibling as a pacesetter, providing a variety of models. As a result, this child may form closer and more significant relations with siblings than with parents. Because of their security-reinforcing influences, the youngest is more striving, self-confident, and persevering than other children.

The most interesting study found during this literature review was conducted by Peter Murdoch (1966). The study dealt with birth order and age at marriage. Murdoch said that first borns are more dependent than later borns (which is contrary to the research that states they are the independent birth order) and also learn that anxiety is reduced when one is with other people. Based on these two assumptions, Murdoch (1966) hypothesized that first borns tend to marry earlier than later borns. He found that oldest males do, on average, marry earlier than later born males. First-born females did not actually marry earlier, but they did talk about getting married earlier than later born females. Furthermore, when asked to say when the best age is to get married, the mean for oldest females was lower than that of later born females (Murdoch 1966).

Firstborns tend to be higher in conformity than are later-born children (Becker, Lerner, & Carroll, 1966). Effects of birth order on personality and social behavior suggest that brothers and sisters (siblings) influence development. First-born children or only children tend to be more cooperative, conscientious, and
cautious than later-born children (Altus, 1966). They also score higher on intelligence tests, go farther in school, and obtain more honors.

Interestingly, there is a great deal of evidence to back up the notion that firstborns commonly achieve more in life. They tend to be more conscientious (Altus 1966) and to accomplish more in school. If chance were at work, we would expect that the first- and second-born children in two-child families would be split evenly in Who’s Who, but of those people in Who’s who came from two-child families a full 64 percent were firstborns. And 52 percent of those from three child families were first borns. These findings are well above chance level. And Richard Zweigenhaft (1975) found that firstborns are also highly over represented in American politics.

Research by Toman (1964) supports Leman (2000). Toman (1964) examined the choice of marriage partners by men who only had brothers. Toman (1964) found that choices of wives for oldest brothers tend to be that of youngest sisters. Furthermore, the choices of a wife for youngest brothers tended to be oldest sisters (Toman 1964). Conversely, Levinger and Sonnheim (1965) conducted a study that negates Toman’s study. Their data failed to confirm Toman’s view that marital adjustment increases with dissimilarity in the partners’ birth orders. In addition, Agnthotry (1986) completed research on a similar topic, the difference being that Agnthotry’s research was not limited to one gender. Agnthotry (1986) found that the best marital adjustment occurs when both spouses are older than they are opposite sex siblings. The worst match occurs when both spouses are younger than they are opposite sex siblings. Another study, looking at birth order and degree of marital satisfaction, found that the oldest brother and youngest sister reported the most marital satisfaction (Pilhakova & Osecka 1993).
In general, firstborn children have been found to be responsible, assertive, task-oriented, perfectionist, and supporters of authority. Because they often look after their younger siblings, they get experience leading and mentoring others, often rising to leadership positions as adults. Nearly half of all U.S. presidents were firstborns; only four were lastborns. Studies have also linked firstborn children with higher academic achievement and possibly higher intelligence scores when compared to later-born children. This may be due to more exposure to adult language and greater interactions with parents. Firstborns often choose professions that require precision, such as careers in science, medicine, law, engineering, computer science, or accounting.

The middle child may have an even-temper and a take it or leave it attitude Alfred Adler (1964) believed that the middle child feels squeezed out of a position of privilege and significance. The child is internally compelled to find peace within the family and may have trouble finding a place or become a fighter of injustice. Middle children have also been found to succeed in team sports, and both they and lastborns have been found to be more socially adjusted if they come from large families.

Firstborns can harbor some resentment toward siblings because parental attention has to be shared. They strive to hang onto parental affection by conforming, either to their parents' wishes, their teachers', or societies. If this does not bring the attention they want, some firstborns defy authority and misbehave or rebel.

Firstborns are typically believed to be serious, conscientious, directive, goal-oriented, aggressive, rule-conscious, exacting, conservative, organized, responsible, jealous, fearful, high achieving, competitive, high in self-esteem, and anxious. They may learn the concept of power at a young age, and this can be
expressed in their desire to help, protect and lead others. The firstborn may also have the need to regain praise from their parents that they received before their siblings were born. The first born may come to feel unloved through the perceived loss of mother's love to the new baby. Adler (1964) referred to this as being "dethroned" by the younger sibling. Later in life the firstborn may become authoritarian or strict. A firstborn's common feeling of a fear of losing the top position may make them more risk averse, and thus less likely to embark on a new venture.

There are several aspects of the family structure that pertain to firstborn children. First time parents are usually highly anxious and "sweat all the details." They document every milestone, celebrate each small achievement, and worry if it comes later than expected. They put the firstborn child under a lot of pressure to succeed. In addition to parental behavior, the firstborn child is often shocked by the introduction of a competitor into the family. This may lead to sibling rivalry. On the other hand, younger siblings often idolize the first born, putting the first born in a position of leader of the children of the family.

Firstborn also differ from later born in emotional behavior. Not only do they tend to be more successful, they also tend to be somewhat more anxious and dependent than younger siblings (Schachter, 1959, 1963).

Second and third children seem to be higher in social skills and more able to get along well with friends outside the family. There is some evidence that later children are more achievement-oriented in athletics than firstborns (Chen & Cobb, 1960).

It has been suggested that it is parental inexperience, anxiety or incompetence rather than the experience of dethronement that may instill greater
anxiety in first borns (Sears et al., 1957; Lasko, 1954 in Ernst & Angst, 1983). First-born individuals may experience more inconsistent treatment, which is thought to be detrimental to formation of a stable self-concept and foster greater dependence and fearfulness (Hilton, 1967 in Ernst & Angst, 1983). This would also account for some similar characteristics displayed by only children (Ernst & Angst, 1983). Parents tend to become more experienced and permissive with later borns.

Middleborn children have a diverse range of personalities. The habits of many middleborns are motivated by the fact that they have never been truly in the spotlight. The firstborn always seems to be achieving and pioneering ahead, while the younger sibling is secure in his or her niche as the entertainer of the family. Middleborn children are often believed to be natural mediators. They tend to have fewer pictures in the family photo album alone, compared to firstborns. Middleborn children may avoid conflict. They may also be highly loyal to the peer group and have many friends. The middle born child may develop good social skills and have an easier time growing up with an other-centered point of view. It has been suggested that middleborn children are more likely to be entrepreneurs. Karen E. Klein, a Los Angeles-based writer, suggested that a middleborn's innate skills in diplomacy plus their flexibility in ideas make them more successful in entrepreneurship.

A child's place in the sibling line-up is also significant and firstborns share certain advantages of online. Both only and firstborn children are ambitious, directive, independent, somewhat more intelligent, especially verbally, self-sufficient, internal, and achievement oriented (Thompson, 1947).

Some lastborns transfer this powerlessness into a personal asset by becoming the boss of the family, coyly eliciting or openly demanding their own
way. Some families jump to and cater to these lastborns. Other lastborns engage in sibling rivalry because of the injustices they think they experience because they are the youngest. Some ally with firstborns against middle borns. The names given to the youngest child are revealing: the youngest child of the family is viewed as the baby of the family, an outgoing charmer, or an entertainer who is unafraid to test his or her luck. While this is certainly not true of all youngest siblings, proponents of this theory state that the youngest of the family is an endearing, and delightful friend.

The youngest child is often babied or "pampered" more than the other siblings. This "pampering," according to Adler, is one of the worst behaviors a parent can bestow on a child. "Pampering" can lead to dependence, and selfishness as well as irresponsibility when the youngest enters adulthood. However, this is not true of all families and of course these characteristics can be present in the oldest, as well as the middle children. Some parents are strict or barely affectionate to their kids or do not have the money to spoil or pamper their children. Youngest children can easily become manipulative and control-seeking if their sibling(s), parents, or other peers are overbearing or bossy.

In general, the firstborn child tends to be more achievement-oriented than his siblings. He is the one most likely to achieve eminence in academic and scientific areas and in business (Sutton-Smith, 1958). The same is true for the only child, who is really a special case of the firstborn; he is just never dethroned by later siblings.

Why are firstborn children more likely to achieve eminence, and why do later children tend to have greater social skills? Firstborn are only children for several months or years. Their parents give them exclusive attention and provide sophisticated behavior models. Parents also tend to be more anxious about the
firstborn's achievements—whether he is late in walking, whether he is too aggressive, whether he is slow in school. One result of this attention is that firstborn children are likely to speak earlier (Koch, 1956a). They are also apt to be more adult oriented, to be more conscientious, and to have more achievement anxiety (McArther, 1956).

The research on sociability and birth order concluded that last-born were the most sociable (Segal, 1978) perhaps because they were not likely to win at competitions (due to their younger age and lower competency) and thus developed a more adaptive affiliative orientation. Singh (1985) reported that last-born were more extroverted; sociability is a major component of extroversion. Kaur and Dheer (1982), on the other hand, found no effect of birth order on introversion/extroversion. Schneider (1981) found that only children had lower Social Interest Scale scores than first-, second-, or middle-born with middle-born scoring higher than younger born. Falbo (1977) concluded that only children show less of a need for affiliation and exhibit more trusting interaction styles. This may be related to the lower affection deprivation experienced by only children.

One way of thinking about an alcoholic is as a person who does not use the company of others to solve his problems. This would suggest that first-born children would be less likely to be alcoholics those later-born children. A study by Bakan (1949) shows that a significantly greater proportion of alcoholics are later-born children that would be expected by chance, on the other hand, we would expect a greater proportion of first-born children to use psychotherapy to handle their problems, since this involves the help of another person. Wiener and Strepner studied veterans who were receiving disability pensions for nervous disorders. They found that first-born veterans were more likely to go into
psychotherapy and were likely to stay in treatment for a longer period than later-born veterans (Wiener and Steeper, reported by Schachter, 1959).

Middle children have also been found to succeed in team sports, and both they and lastborns have been found to be more socially adjusted if they come from large families.

Birth order research has been an intriguing subject since the time of Alfred Adler (1927), who first introduced the theory of psychological birth positions. Birth order is an area of research that researchers and lay people alike can relate to. Everyone holds some position in a family, and has taken with them the experiences and influences of that position.

Alfred Adler (1870-1937) concluded that the middle born children often report feeling inferior to older children because they do not possess their sibling’s advanced abilities. Sometimes, they are very competitive with their firstborn sibling. Others choose to focus their energies in areas different from those in which their older siblings are already established. This competition with firstborns drives second born and middle born to innovation, doing or being different from their older siblings in order to make they stand out in the family dynamic. In truth, they often are more competent at an earlier age than their older siblings because they have had their example to follow.

Middle children can feel forgotten or overlooked because of the attention or demands of either the firstborns or the lastborns. Some of these children never seem to find their place in the social order, and they try to rebel or misbehave in order to draw attention to themselves. Some of these troubled middle children bully younger siblings or children at school.
Other middle children capitalize on the injustice they feel as children and become trial lawyers or social activists because such roles allow them to fight against other social injustices. Some middle born becomes very socially skilled because they have learned to negotiate and compromise daily with their siblings and their parents. Some of these children are often called the peacemakers of the household.

2.2 Family size and Family environment

Popular advice to prospective parents often recommends limiting family size in the interests of “child quality.” Many such counselors contend that parental affection, attention, and material resources are diluted with each additional birth, resulting in children who are intellectually less able—especially those who are later born. Do large families make low-IQ children, as prevailing attitudes suggest? Or do parents with lower IQs—as a result of heredity, environment, or both—tend to have larger families? For decades, researchers could not resolve this issue because they had access only to samples of unrelated children growing up in different homes, in which comparisons of first-born and later-born children were confounded with other family characteristics, such as SES (which declines as family size increases).

Starting in 1972, the U. S. National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) followed a representative sample of more than 3,000 U.S. 14-to 22-year-olds; in 1986 the children of the original participants were added to the investigation. Because both cohorts took IQ tests, researchers could examine the relationship of IQ to sibling birth order within families to determine whether having more children depresses children’s intellectual functioning. They also could correlate maternal IQ with family size, for insight into whether lower-IQ parents are prone to have larger families.
Although many good reasons exist for limiting family size, the concern that additional births will reduce children’s intelligence and life chances is not warranted. Instead, young people with lower IQs—many of who dropped out of school, live in poverty, lack hope for their future, and fail to engage in family planning—are most likely to have large families. For adolescents with these risk factors, educational and family planning interventions are crucial.

David B.L. (2007) viewed as the baby of the family, and outgoing charmer, or an entertainer unafraid to test his luck; the youngest child is often babied of pampered more than other siblings. Pampering can lead to dependence, and selfishness as well as irresponsibility when he enters adulthood. Youngest children can easily become control seeking if their sibling (s), parents or other peers are overbearing or bossy.

Sibling rivalry tends to increase in middle childhood. As children participate in a wider range of activities, parents often compare siblings’ traits and accomplishments. The child who gets less parental affection, more disapproval, or fewer material resources is likely to be resentful and to show poorer adjustment over time (Brody, 2004; 2004b). For same-sex siblings who are close in age, parental comparisons are more frequent, resulting in more quarreling and antagonism and poorer adjustment. This effect is particularly strong when parenting is cold or harsh (Feinberg & Hetherington, 2001). A survey of a nationally representative sample of nearly 23,000 Canadian children revealed that differential treatment of siblings increased when parents were under stress as a result of financial worries, marital conflict, the pressures of caring for several children, or single parenthood (Jenkins, Rasbash, & O’Connor, 2003). Parents whose energies are drained become less careful about being fair. Children react especially intensely when fathers prefer one child.
Perhaps because fathers spend less time with children, their favouritism is more noticeable and triggers anger (Brody, Stoneman, & McCoy, 1992; Brody et al., 1992).

Also, a good marriage is linked to preschool siblings’ capacity to cope adaptively with jealousy and conflict (Volling, McElwain, & Miller, 2002). Perhaps good communication between parents serves as a model of effective problem solving. It may also foster a happy family environment, which results in less reason for siblings to feel jealous.

Nevertheless, individual differences in sibling relationships appear shortly after the younger sibling’s arrival, temperament affects how positive or conflict-ridden sibling interaction will be. In addition, maternal warmth toward both children is related to positive sibling interaction and to preschoolers’ support of a distressed younger sibling (Volling, 2001; Volling & Belsky, 1992). Of course, a child’s temperament and other attributes might account for quality of interaction with both siblings and parents. But parenting is also influential: Mothers who frequently play with their young children and head off potential conflicts by explaining the toddler’s wants and needs to the preschool sibling foster sibling cooperation. In contrast, maternal harshness and lack of involvement result in increasingly antagonistic sibling relationships (Howe, Aquan-Assee, & Bukowski, 2001).

Despite a drop in companionship, attachment between siblings, like closeness to parents, remains strong for most young people. Teenage brothers and sisters who established a positive bond in early childhood and whose parents continue to be warm and involved are more likely to express affection and caring (Dunn, Slomkowski, & Beardsall, 1994). Also, mild sibling differences in perceived parental affection no longer trigger jealousy but, instead,
predict increasing sibling warmth (Feinberg et al., 2003) Siblings often strive to be different from one another. Perhaps adolescents interpret a unique parental relationship—as long as it is generally accepting—as a gratifying sing of their own individuality. Older siblings frequently offer useful advice as their younger teenage and sisters’ face challenges in peer relationships, schoolwork, and decisions about the future. A positive sibling bond during early adolescence is linked to future, more gratifying friendships (Yeh & Lempers, 2004). And young people who have difficulty making friends sometimes turn to siblings for compensating support (Seginer, 1998).

Although conflict rises during the school years, siblings continue to rely on one another for companionship, emotional support, and assistance with everyday tasks. In a study in which siblings reported on their shared daily activities in evening telephone interviews, participants mentioned that older children often assisted younger siblings with academic and peer challenges. And both members of sibling pairs offered each other assistance with family issues (Tucker, McHale, & Crouter, 2001). When parents are distant and uninvolved, siblings sometimes fill in and become more supportive of one another (Bank, Patterson, & Reid, 1996). Like parent-child relationships, sibling interactions adapt to development at adolescence. As younger siblings become more self-sufficient, they accept less direction from their older brothers and sisters. Consequently, sibling influence declines during the teenage years. Furthermore, as adolescents become more involved in friendships and romantic relationships, they invest less time and energy in their siblings, who are part of the family from which they are trying to establish autonomy. As a result, sibling relationships often become less intense, in both positive and negative feelings (Hetherington, Henderson, & Reiss, 1999; Stocker & Dunn, 1994).
The arrival of a baby brother or sister is a difficult experience for most preschoolers, who quickly realize that now they must share their parents' attention and affection. They often become demanding and clingy, engage in deliberate naughtiness, and display other immature behaviors. Security of attachment also declines, more so if they are over age 2 (old enough to feel threatened and displaced) and the mother is under stress due to marital or psychological problems (Baydar, Greek, & Brooks-Gunn, 1997; Teti et al., 1996).

Because of their frequency and emotional intensity, sibling interactions become unique contexts in which social competence expands. Between their second and fourth birthdays, younger siblings take a more active role in play. As a result, sibling conversations increase. And siblings who are close in age relate to one another on a more equal footing than parents and children. They often engage in joint pretend, talk about feelings, tease, deceive, and—when conflicts arise—call attention to their own wants and needs. The skills acquired during sibling interaction contribute to understanding of emotions and other mental states, perspective taking, moral maturity, and competence in relating to other children. Consistent with these outcome, positive sibling ties predict favorable adjustment, even hostile children at risk for social difficulties (Stormshak et al., 1996)

Favourable development also characterizes only children in China, where a one-child family policy has been strictly enforced in urban areas for more than two decades to control over-population. Compared with agemates who have siblings, Chinese only children are advanced in cognitive development and academic achievement (Falbo & Poston, 1993; Jiao, Ji, & Jing, 1996). They also feel more emotionally secure, perhaps because government disapproval promotes tension in families with more than one child (Yang et al., 1995). Chinese mothers go out of their way to ensure that their children have regular
contact with first cousins (who are considered siblings). Perhaps as a result, Chinese only children do not differ from agemates with siblings in social skills and peer acceptance (Chen, Rubin, & Li, 1995; Hart et al., 1998). The next generation of Chinese only children, however, will have no first cousins.

Both the high parental expectations usually reserved for eldest children and the pampering lavished on the youngest sibling in a family is often experienced by only children. Some research indicates that only children who attempt to fulfill all their parents' expectations are retarded in developing adulthood autonomy and are less independent than any other birth order (Byrd et al., 1993 in Buckley, 1998). This may be especially true of female only children who are traditionally expected to be more involved with their parents across the lifespan.

Rice F.P. (1992) viewed that the youngest in the family are also usually given special attention because they are the youngest. The youngest child gets special attention from older brothers and sisters. Because there are others to socialize with, researchers find that later-born children usually possess better social skills than do the firstborn.

Although sibling relationships bring many benefits, they are not essential for healthy development. Contrary to popular belief, only children are not spoiled. Rather, they are advantaged in some respects. North American children growing up in one-child families are higher in self-esteem and achievement motivation. Consequently, they do better in school and attain higher levels of education (Falbo, 1992). One reason may be that only children have somewhat closer relationships with parents, who may exert more pressure for mastery and accomplishment. Furthermore, only children have just as many close, high-quality friendships as children with siblings. However, they tend to be less well
accepted in the peer group, perhaps because they have not had opportunities to
learn effective conflict-resolution strategies through sibling interactions
(Kitzmann, Cohen, & Lockwood, 2002).

Adolescence is a transitional and developmental period in which there is
redefinition and reorganization of family relations. During this transition from
childhood to adulthood, the task of development of autonomy has been
considered as important. It means the ability to have a significant control over
one’s life, to be able to make decisions and to relinquish the dependencies on
others. Crittenden (1990) has defined autonomy as “capacities for taking
responsibility for one’s own behaviour, making decisions regarding one’s own
life and maintaining supportive relationships”.

Contemporary researchers have tried to examine the interrelationships
between aspects of autonomy (Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986), the place of
emotional distance from parents in process of healthy development (Lamborn &
Steinberg, 1993) and even the influence of familial and nonfamilial roles and
contexts on the development of self-reliance and responsible independence
(Lamborn & Steinberg 1993; Tremper & Kelly, 1987).

The theories outlined by Steinberg and Silverberg (1986) have brought
into forefront the term “detachment” to describe emotional autonomy. The term
“detachment” indicates adolescents withdrawing from the family and moving
towards new attachments in wider community. It may represent not only a
casting off infantile ties but a more general reluctance to rely on the parents as
they maybe rejecting and unsupportive.
It has been suggested that only children have poorer interpersonal skills which result in less effective or fulfilling relationships. The proposed relationship has been suggested as resulting in poorer mental health; however this has not been borne out empirically (Falbo, 1984). There is some evidence that only children are actually under-represented among psychiatric and other clinical populations (Falbo, 1984). However in childhood they are referred more often for therapeutic intervention. This has been attributed to closer monitoring and overprotectiveness of parents (Falbo, 1984). However the assumption of poor social skills of only children is being put to rest (Buckley, 1998).

Several researchers share the general hypothesis that parent adolescence interactions that encourage differentiation and also sent a message of acceptance and connection should facilitate positive outcomes including healthy identity, perspective taking skills, ego development and self-esteem (Hauser et al., 1984; Eccles, et al., 1991; Allison & Sabatelli, 1988). The normative task in adolescence could be the same for both boys and girls-to develop a healthy balance between autonomy and ties with parents but it is more of a challenge to disengage from the parents for the girls than it is for boys. In our culture, boys experience more conflict with their parents and are less likely to accept parental regulations as appropriate. Whereas girls are more emotionally dependent on their parents. Sexual roles and gender differences lay different paths for boys and girls in developing autonomy.

Surveys of literature predating 1945 emphasized the abnormality of only children's familial situation and risk of lifelong unhappiness and psychopathology. More recent investigations offer a more optimistic outlook (Ernst & Angst, 1983). In a thorough review of literature relating to only children throughout the lifespan (Falbo, 1984), much conflicting evidence, but no detrimental effects, were noted regarding development or mental health.
However it was acknowledged that not much research followed individuals into adult life to determine if possible effects of being raised as a sole child has any lasting consequences (Falbo, 1984).

However several researchers take the above notion quite seriously and accord greater significance to relational ties, support and social commitments as a part of autonomy, the adolescents can develop their independence without needing to cut off with their parents (Montemayor, 1983). “The adolescents must strike a balance between enmeshment with parental identifications and complete disengagement and isolation” (Lapsley et.al., 1983)

Yet resentment is only one feature of a rich emotional relationship that starts to build between siblings after the baby’s birth. The older child can also be seen kissing, patting, and calling out, “Mom, he needs you” when the baby cries-sings of affection and sympathetic concern. By the end of the baby’s first year, siblings typically spend much time together, with the preschooler helping, sharing toys, imitating, and expressing friendliness in addition to anger and ambivalence (Dunn & Kendrick, 1982). Infants of this age are comforted by the presence of their preschool-age brother or sister during the mother’s short absences. And during the second year, toddlers often imitate and join in play with the older child (Dunn, 1989).

According to the psychoanalytic view, the development of healthy autonomy is encouraged through the adolescent’s detachment from family ties, a process that involves relinquishing childish dependencies and becoming disillusioned with parents (Bloom 1980; Blos, 1979; Freud, 1958). Blos’s (1967) neo-analytic theory of individuation states that adolescents should rely on their resources, should feel individuated and should be able to become mature and competent.
The adolescent's first and normative context of development is the family. Parent adolescent relationships should involve the process of striking a balance between the development of individuality and self-reliance of the adolescent on one hand and a sense of connection and parental guidance on the other. When there is an effective combination of cohesion and separation in the family, then the autonomy development of the adolescence is healthy.

More recently, a transition can be seen away from the dyadic definition of the family, towards consideration of multiple participant decision making. Whereas earlier studies on family decision making only really examined spousal interaction (Davis 1976, Burns 1977, McDonald 1980), greater importance is now being placed on the role and impact of children in decisions (Belch, Belch and Sciglimpaglia 1980, Moschis and Mitchell 1986, Foxman and Tansuhaj 1988). However, the triadic interaction of mother, father and child in family decision making is still a relatively unexplored area, and the research that has been carried out has developed ad hoc with limited attempts made to integrate concepts.

A large proportion of the research in this area concentrates on measuring the amount of influence that children have in family purchase decision making (Mehrotra and Torges 1977; Szybillo and Sosanie 1977; Jenkins 1979; Nelson 1979; Roberts, Wortzel and Berkeley 1981; Darley and Lim 1986; Isler, Popper and Ward 1987; Foxman and Tansuhaj 1988; Foxman, Tansuhaj and Ekstrom 1989). While all these studies confirmed that children have at least some influence in decisions for an array of purchases, very little attempt has been made to define "influence". Past studies have also obtained little more than perceptive measures of relative involvement in family decision making, rather than modelling the interaction of members, and analysing the relationships between family processes and resultant behaviours. Static measures of perceived influence only describe the individual motives and actions of family members and not the
dynamic interaction of these members. Analysis of the triadic interaction of mothers, fathers, and children in family purchase decision making should examine both family and consumer factors, and should include some measure of both the action and reaction of family members. Measures of individual influence (action) do little to explain the actual effect this has on family processes or the decision made (reaction).

Conceptual models such as Sheth's (1974) Theory of Family Buying Decisions provide a useful basis on which to build future research. However, the sheer complexity of Sheth's (1974) model in particular means that empirical and theoretical justice of concepts is more likely if the components are broken down and their contingency and integration tested systematically, in the family environment, among family members. Understanding the interaction of family members in making purchase decisions also requires that the broader operating environment is understood. Included in the operating environment of family decision making are the macro-structural components of the family, and the micro-relational components which include those factors that individual members bring with them to the interaction, and those which manifest as a result of interaction. One component of Sheth's (1974) model which allows for analysis of both the operating environment of the family, and their consumer interaction, is family purchase conflict.

The concentration on measurement of "influence" of members in family decision making has resulted in findings which are abstract and unexplained in relation to their dependent state. This may largely be due to the attempts at analysing the family decision making process as a general concept, instead of the total of many component parts. One of these component processes is the resolution of conflict. Conflict resolution in family purchase decision making represents an interactive and behavioural process. Factors which may be
expected to impact upon decision making in general could be more easily analysed by concentrating first on their relationship to specific behavioural processes. It may be that analysis of limited but specific and definable behavioural variables, such as conflict resolution strategies, are a more constructive focus than abstract measures of "influence".

There also exist cross-cultural differences in the development of autonomy. In India, parents' views are generally accepted. Kakar (1978) observed that the strong ties to family continue into adulthood, with continued emotional dependence on family, particularly on mother. Indian girls spend much less time with peers as they are given less freedom of movement (Bharat, 1977). Biswas (1992) states that the traditional, affectional, religious and economic bonds that create family cohesion are weakening. "Nucleation has depleted the emotional surround of the individuals". Indian adolescents are gradually moving to achieve autonomy and reducing dependency on parents.

It is evident from the literature that researchers have devoted greater attention to the influence of familial and the gender differences in adolescent autonomy development. However despite the issues being tackled, the concept of autonomy still continues to be elusive and the inconsistencies in the literature need to be clarified. This exploratory study aims to study the inconsistent picture of the relationship of the family environment with emotional autonomy and how males and females in their middle and late adolescent years differ on emotional autonomy dimension.

Understanding household conflict is critical to understanding the dynamics of household decision behaviour and the decision strategies employed in family decision making (Davis 1976, Qualls and Jaffe 1992). The study of conflict resolution processes in particular, is an area which involves both the
interactive and behavioural dimensions of family decision making which is lacking in many other areas of this field. Granbois (cited in Qualls 1988), has long contended that household conflict behaviour better reflects the dynamic process of family decision making than more traditional input-outcome models of family decision making.

Research on gender differences in development of autonomy reveals several inconsistencies. Douvan and Adelson (1966), Coleman (1961) suggested that boys develop autonomous behaviour more rapidly than girls. On the other hand, recent literature of Steinberg & Silverberg (1986) found emotional autonomy during early adolescence to be greater among girls, with girls scoring high on self-reliance scales.
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